

REMARKS

Claims 1-5 are pending in this application. None of the claims is currently amended. Reconsideration is requested.

The presently claimed invention distinguishes the cited references because the access point selects only one of the collected bid messages, and consequently associates with only one station bidding to become associated with the access point, in a given auction cycle. One advantage of this technique is mitigation of hunting-roaming and forced overload of access points. The cited references teach the well known technique according to which an access point accepts every station which attempts to become associated with that access point. Karaoguz states that the central server sends instructions to the access points¹, not requests. Further, if operating in accordance with IEEE 802.11 as described,² the messages sent by the station are “probes” and “reassociation requests,” which differ from bid messages because they cannot be denied by the receiving access point. Claim 1 therefore distinguishes the cited references by reciting “logic for selecting **one of the bid messages** based at least in-part on the parameter related to distance” (emphasis added). Claim 5 recites similar language. Claims 2-4 are dependent claims which further distinguish the invention, and which are allowable for the same reasons as their respective base claims.

¹ Paragraphs 0052, 0053, for example

² Paragraph 0049

For the reasons discussed above, and in view of the claim amendments, this application is now considered to be in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited. The Examiner is encouraged to contact Applicants' Attorney at the number listed below to discuss any matters which might expedite prosecution of this application.

Respectfully Submitted,

June 19, 2006
Date

/Holmes W. Anderson/
Holmes Anderson, Reg. No. 37,272
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)
McGuinness & Manaras LLP
125 Nagog Park
Acton, MA 01720
(978) 264-6664

Docket No. 160-055
Dd: 6/19/2006